Christina A. DiEdoardo (SBN 258714) 1 The Matian Firm, APC 111 N. Market Street, Suite 888 2 San Jose, California 95113 Tel (408) 516-1208 Fax (408) 516-1209 christina@matianlegal.com 4 Attorney for Defendant JESUS DIAZ-MAGALLON 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 **SAN JOSE DIVISION** 7 Case No. 5:21-mj-70636-MAG UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 8 Plaintiff, STIPULATION AND ORDER (AS MODIFIED) 9 CONTINUING PRELIMINARY HEARING UNTIL JANUARY 28, 2022 10 v. 11 **IESUS** DIAZ-MAGALLON a/k/a "CHUY" and 12 LANCE TORREGROZA 13 Defendants. Date: 14 Time: Dept: 15 16 The parties, through their counsel of record, stipulate as follows: 17 A preliminary hearing is set in this case for December 7, 2021. However, the government has 18 produced a significant amount of discovery in this case and Ms. Christina DiEdoardo, counsel for 19 defendant JESUS DIAZ-MAGALLON, unexpectedly fell ill on Sunday, December 5, 2021. 20 Therefore, the parties wish to continue the preliminary hearing until January 28, 2022, at 2:00 p.m. 21 before the San Jose Duty Magistrate. Therefore, the parties hereby stipulate and agree: 22 1. The time between December 7, 2021, and January 28, 2022, should be excluded under the 23 Speedy Trial Act because failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense 24 counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the

25

## 

1	exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The ends of justice serv		1(h)(7)(B)(iv). The ends of justice served by
2		granting the requested continuance outweigh th	ne best interests of the public and the defendant
3		in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of	of criminal cases. See id. §3161(h)(7)(A).
4	2.	Taking into account the public interest in the pr	rompt disposition of criminal cases, there is
5		good cause to extend the time limits under Fed	eral Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c).
6		Accordingly, the time limits for conducting a p	reliminary hearing are tolled from December 7
7		2021, until January 28, 2022.	
8			
9	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
10	DATE: D	ecember 6, 2021	/s/Christina A. DiEdoardo
11			Christina A. DiEdoardo Attorney for Defendant Diaz-Magallon
12	DATE: December 6, 2021		/s/Vicki H. Young Vicki H. Young
13			Attorney for Defendant Lance Torregroza
14	DATE: D	ecember 6, 2021	/s/Ross Weingarten Ross Weingarten
15			Assistant United States Attorney
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22   23			
23   24			
2 <del>4</del>   25			

## **ORDER**

Based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between December 7, 2021, and January 28, 2022, would deny counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

The Court further finds that the ends of justice served by excluding the time between December 7, 2021, and January 28, 2022, from computation under the Speedy Trial Act outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The Court also finds good cause for extending the time limits for a preliminary hearing under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 and for extending the 30-day time period for an indictment under the Speedy Trial Act (based on the exclusions set forth above). See Fed. R. Crim. P. 5.1; 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b).

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the time between December 7, 2021, and January 28, 2022, shall be excluded from computation under the Speedy Trial Act. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv) and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1.

DATED: December 6, 2021

